

DRAFT

INDOT

**Consultant Performance Evaluation Manual
4/8/08**

Overview

6.1 Basic Rating System

INDOT will evaluate the performance of a consultant's work at the time of submittal of each deliverable and at other times as appropriate. Copies of the evaluations will be distributed to consultants immediately after they are completed.

INDOT will utilize the following scoring system based on "Impact on the Department" type descriptions:

- +2 (Exceeds) The consultant exceeded the requirements and expectations of the scope of services.
- 0 (Satisfactory) The consultant produced an acceptable work product with minimal involvement by INDOT.
- 1 (Improvement Required) The consultant's work required substantive comments and/or action by INDOT.
- 3 (Unsatisfactory) Extensive involvement by INDOT personnel required.

B. Totals and Subtotals - Total Points Divided by Points Possible

6.2 Sub consultants

INDOT will collect quality data on sub consultants when they are the responsible firm for a deliverable element of work that is typically evaluated. If the deliverable is a report or a set of plans the firm to receive the evaluation is the firm that would sign the report or apply an engineer's seal to the plans. Project management performance attributes associated with a contract such as for schedule compliance will always be attributed to the lead firm.

6.3 Rating Forms Specific to Project Type

INDOT will utilize forms specific to services completed, including Design, Environmental, Bridge Inspection, Task Order, Real Estate Acquisition and Construction Inspection. INDOT will rate all performances on common management and timeliness criteria and scoring.

6.4 Conference with the Consultant

INDOT's performance evaluations provide information for INDOT's use in selecting consultants and will serve as a report card to the consultant and the associated opportunity to strengthen areas of weakness. Upon completion of the services the Contract Manager and Project Manager will be required to schedule a **conference** with the consultant. The consultant will be provided with a copy of the evaluations and have an opportunity to discuss and comment.

Table of Contents

Project Development Contract Performance Evaluation Criteria	4
Project Management Reviewer's Rating Items	4
Roadway Design	6
Hydraulics	7
TRAFFIC SIGNAL, SIGNING & LIGHTING:	9
Bridge Design	12
Bridge Rehabilitation	13
Geotechnical Engineering Performance Evaluation Criteria	16
R/W Plan Performance Evaluation Criteria	18
R/W PLAN REPORTS -	18
Bridge Inspection Performance Evaluation Criteria	22
Inspection and Testing	22
Structural Analysis and Load Capacity Ratings	23
Report and Recommendations	25
Environmental Agreement Performance Evaluation Criteria	28
Environmental Project	28
ENVIROMENTAL DOCUMENT	28
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	28
SECTION 4(f) DOCUMENT	29
Ecological	30
ECOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT	30
WETLAND REPORTS/ DELINEATION	30
WETLAND METIGATIONCONCEPTUAL PLAN	31
Final Wetland Mitigation Plans	32
AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS	32
Noise Analysis and Abatement Design	33
NOISE ANALYSIS	33
ABATEMENT DESIGN	33
Right of Way Acquisition Services Performance Evaluation Criteria	45

Project Development Contract Performance Evaluation Criteria

Project Management Reviewer's Rating Items

1. BUDGET: Did the consultant adopt Planning's budget into the design process sufficiently to maintain cost effectiveness?

- ☐ **Exceeds:** The designer improved the Planning budget by more than 5%.
- ☐ **Satisfactory:** The designer maintained the Planning budget within 5%.
- ☐ **Improvement Required:** The designer had budget slippage of 5% – 10%.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory:** The designer exceeded the budget by more than 10%.

2. SCOPE: Did the consultant define Planning's scope to integrate the design process sufficiently to improve cost effectiveness?

- ☐ **Exceeds:** The designer used innovative methods developing the project to reduce costs, schedule, and environmental impact or to improve safety.
- ☐ **Satisfactory:** The designer develops the projects to the specified objectives.
- ☐ **Improvement Required:** The designer allowed some scope creep.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory:** The designer had excessive scope creep.

3. SCHEDULE:

a. Did the Consultant meet intermediate submittal dates?

- ☐ **Exceeds:** The consultant provided an acceptable intermediate submittal within the schedule in all cases and exceeded the schedule by 7 calendar days for more than 50% of the intermediate submittals.
- ☐ **Satisfactory:** The consultant provided acceptable intermediate submittals within the schedule or was late by 7 calendar days or less for less than 50% of intermediate submittals.
- ☐ **Improvement Required:** The consultant was more than 7 calendar days late in providing any acceptable intermediate submittal, or more than 50% of intermediate submittals were late.

- ☐ **Unsatisfactory:** The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

b. Did the consultant meet final contract time requirements?

- ☐ **Exceeds:** An acceptable final work product was certified “ready for delivery” more than 30 calendar days ahead of schedule.
- ☐ **Satisfactory:** An acceptable final work product was delivered within the scheduled time.
- ☐ **Improvement Required:** An acceptable final work product was delivered up to two months behind schedule.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory:** An acceptable final work product was delivered more than two months behind schedule.

4. CONSTRUCTABILITY: Did the consultant integrate construction knowledge and experience into the design process to enhance plans and specifications and improve cost effectiveness?

- ☐ **Exceeds:** The designer has properly implemented into design some major constructability concepts to improve cost effectiveness and schedule.
- ☐ **Satisfactory:** The designer has implemented minor constructability concepts with some costs reduction.
- ☐ **Improvement Required:** The designer has implemented constructability issues with no impact.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory:** The designer has validated no constructability improvements.

5. RESPONSIVENESS: How well did the consultant respond to the reviewer?

- ☐ **Exceeds:** Willingness to answer questions and make requested changes. Exceeded expectations. The designer project coordination was proactive in addressing project issues.
- ☐ **Satisfactory:** The designer did revise the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and/or explained why revisions were not made. The designer handled project coordination. The designer showed a willingness to answer questions.
- ☐ **Improvement Required:** The designer did not revise some of the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and did not explain why some of the revisions were not made. The designer showed some cooperation at handling project coordination. The designer showed some cooperation in answering questions but required several requests.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory:** The designer did not comply with any of the above.

Roadway Design

6. DESIGN CONCEPT - Did the designer's Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage for roadway and maintenance of traffic result in a practical, economical and constructible design?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage fit the terrain and surrounding nature of the road. Cut and fill were investigated and factored into the design. Property owners on both sides of the road were considered and the design minimizes right of way as much as possible.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage fit the terrain and surrounding nature of the road and had only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage do not fit the terrain and surrounding nature of the road and required one to two major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Resubmission is required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. The design is totally inadequate. Resubmission is required.

7. DESIGN ELEMENTS - Did the Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage for roadway and maintenance of traffic meet Design requirements?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage met all design requirements and exceeded expectations.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage met all design requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage did not meet all the design requirements and required one to two major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above.

8. PLAN/ QUALITY - Were the details complete relating to Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage for roadway and maintenance of traffic? Did the plan preparation meet INDOT requirements? Did the plans follow Federal, State, and Local Policies ?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage details were complete and exceeded expectations. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage details were complete and only had minor errors. The plans required only minor revisions. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The Alignment, Profile, Geometrics and Drainage details were incomplete and required major revisions. The plans required one to two major

revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Resubmission is required.

- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. The plans were not acceptable. Resubmission is required.

9. DOCUMENTATION OF WORK - Did the designer submit the required documentation to meet INDOT requirements?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The required documentation was complete and exceeded expectations. The documentation required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The required documentation was complete and only had minor errors. The documentation required only minor revisions. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be corrected without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The required documentation was incomplete and required one to two major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Resubmission is required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. Resubmission is required.

10. RESPONSIVENESS – How well did the designer respond to the reviewer?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – Willingness to answer questions and make requested changes exceeded expectations.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The designer did revise the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and/or explained why revisions were not made. The designer showed a willingness to answer questions.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The designer did not revise most of the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and did not explain why most of the revisions were not made. The designer showed some responsiveness in answering questions. Resubmission is required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. Resubmission is required.

Hydraulics

11. DESIGN CONCEPT - Was the proper structure size and type chosen for the site i.e. was the design adequate practical and economical?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The structure was properly sized for the site and incorporated innovative cost saving design features.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The structure was properly sized for the site and had only minor errors. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.

- ☐ **Improvement Required** – For example, the structure was more than 10% undersized hydraulically and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

12. DESIGN ELEMENTS- Were INDOT standards and policies followed? Was the design hydraulically adequate and analyzed properly?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – All INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were followed. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – Generally INDOT policies and guidelines were followed. The plans only required minor errors. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – Some INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were ignored. The plans required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – Many INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were not followed. The design was not hydraulically adequate. The design is not acceptable and resubmission is required.

13. PLAN/ REPORT QUALITY- Were the details clear and complete? Did they meet INDOT's plan preparation requirements?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The hydraulics details were complete and exceeded expectations. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The hydraulics details were complete and required only minor revisions. The plans only required minor revisions. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The hydraulics details were incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

14. DOCUMENTATION OF WORK – Did the consultant submit the required documentation to meet INDOT requirements? Were the appropriate design specifications referenced?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The required documentation was complete and exceeded expectations. The documentation required no revisions
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The required documentation was complete and only had minor errors. The documentation required only minor revisions. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be corrected without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The required documentation was incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised documentation and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Few references to design specifications were provided.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

15. RESPONSIVENESS– How well did the designer cooperate with the reviewer?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – willingness to answer questions and make requested changes exceeded expectations.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The designer did revise the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and/or explained why revisions were not made. The designer showed a willingness to answer questions.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The designer did not revise most of the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and did not explain why most of the revisions were not made. The designer showed some cooperation in answering questions.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

TRAFFIC SIGNAL, SIGNING & LIGHTING:

16. DESIGN CONCEPT: Was the proper Traffic Control, Signing and Lighting device chosen for the site i.e. was the design adequate practical and economical?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The Traffic Control, Signing and Lighting device was properly chosen for the site and incorporated innovative cost saving design features. Property owners on the intersection were considered.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The Traffic Control, Signing and Lighting device was properly chosen for the site and had only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - The Traffic Control, Signing and Lighting device do not fit the terrain and surrounding nature of the road and required one to two major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Resubmission is required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. The design is totally inadequate. Resubmission is required.

17. DESIGN ELEMENTS: Were INDOT standards and policies followed? Was the design adequate and analyzed properly?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - All INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were followed. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - Generally INDOT policies and guidelines were followed. The plans only required minor errors. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - Some INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were ignored. The plans required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. Many INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were not followed. The design was not adequate. The design is not acceptable and resubmission is required.

18. PLAN/ REPORT QUALITY: Were the details clear and complete? Did they meet INDOT's plan preparation requirements? Did the plans follow Federal, State, and Local Policies?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The Traffic Control, Signing and Lighting device were complete and exceeded expectations. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The Traffic Control, Signing and Lighting device details were complete and only had minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The plans required one to two major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Resubmission is required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. The plans were not acceptable. Resubmission is required.

19. DOCUMENTATION OF WORK: Did the designer submit the required documentation to meet INDOT requirements?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The required documentation was complete and exceeded expectations. The documentation required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The required documentation was complete and only had minor errors. The documentation required only minor revisions. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be corrected without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The required documentation was incomplete and required one to two major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Resubmission is required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. Resubmission is required.

20. RESPONSIVENESS: How well did the designer respond to the reviewer?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – Willingness to answer questions and make requested changes exceeded expectations.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The designer did revise the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and/or explained why revisions were not made. The designer showed a willingness to answer questions.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The designer did not revise most of the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and did not explain why most of the revisions were not made. The designer showed some responsiveness in answering questions. Resubmission is required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The designer did not comply with any of the above. Resubmission is required.

Traffic Control

1. Did the consultant's Traffic Control plan meet design requirements?

- ☐ Exceeds – The Traffic Control plan met all design requirements and exceeded expectations.

- ☐ Satisfactory –The Traffic Control plan met all design requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
 - ☐ Improvement Required –The Traffic Control plan was incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.
2. Were the Traffic Control Details complete and meet INDOT plan preparation requirements?
- ☐ Exceeds –The Traffic Control Details were complete, met all plan preparation requirements and exceeded expectations.
 - ☐ Satisfactory –The Traffic Control Details were complete but had minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
 - ☐ Improvement Required –The Traffic Control Details were incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Maintenance of Traffic

3. Did the consultant's Maintenance of Traffic plan result in a practical, economical and constructible design?
- ☐ Exceeds – The Maintenance of Traffic plan was selected after considering all available alternatives and exceeded expectations.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – The Maintenance of Traffic plan considers the needs of the traveling public and was selected after several alternatives were explored. Only minor errors were discovered. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – The Maintenance of Traffic plan did not consider more than one plan and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.
4. Did the Maintenance of Traffic plan meet design requirements?
- ☐ Exceeds – The Maintenance of Traffic plan met all design requirements and exceeded expectations.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – The Maintenance of Traffic plan met all design requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – The Maintenance of Traffic plan met design requirements but required major revisions. Major revisions are classified

- as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Bridge Design

21. DESIGN CONCEPT - Was the proper structure size and type chosen for the site i.e. was the design adequate practical and economical?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The structure was properly sized for the site and incorporated innovative cost saving design features.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The structure was properly sized for the site and had only minor errors. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – For example, the structure was more than 10% oversized hydraulically and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

22. DESIGN ELEMENTS- Were INDOT standards and policies followed? Was the design structurally, geometrically and hydraulically adequate?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – All INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were followed. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – Generally INDOT policies and guidelines were followed. The plans only required minor errors. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – Some INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were ignored. The plans required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – Many INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were not followed. The design was not structurally adequate. The design is not acceptable and resubmission is required.

23. PLAN/ REPORT QUALITY- Were the details clear and complete? Did they meet INDOT's plan preparation requirements?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The bridge details were complete and exceeded expectations. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The bridge details were complete and required only minor revisions. The plans only required minor revisions. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The bridge details were incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

24. DOCUMENTATION OF WORK– Did the consultant submit the required documentation to meet INDOT requirements? Were the appropriate design specifications referenced?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The required documentation was complete and exceeded expectations. The documentation required no revisions
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The required documentation was complete and only had minor errors. The documentation required only minor revisions. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be corrected without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The required documentation was incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised documentation and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Few references to design specifications were provided.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

25. RESPONSIVENESS– How well did the designer cooperate with the reviewer?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – willingness to answer questions and make requested changes exceeded expectations.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The designer did revise the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and/or explained why revisions were not made. The designer showed a willingness to answer questions.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The designer did not revise most of the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and did not explain why most of the revisions were not made. The designer showed some cooperation in answering questions.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Bridge Rehabilitation

26. DESIGN CONCEPT– Did the inspection report cover the existing conditions and provide a recommendation that was practical, economical and constructible?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – All aspects of the inspection report were included along with innovative cost/time saving features.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – All aspects of the inspection report were included.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – Major errors required revision.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

27. DESIGN ELEMENTS- Were INDOT standards and policies followed? Was the design structurally, geometrically and hydraulically adequate?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – All INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were followed. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – Generally INDOT policies and guidelines were followed. The plans only required minor errors. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.

- ☐ **Improvement Required** – Some INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were ignored. The plans required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – Many INDOT policies, guidelines and recommendations were not followed. The design was not structurally adequate. The design is not acceptable and resubmission is required.

28. PLAN/ REPORT QUALITY- Were the details clear and complete? Did they meet INDOT's plan preparation requirements?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The bridge details were complete and exceeded expectations. The plans required no revisions.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The bridge details were complete and required only minor revisions. The plans only required minor revisions. Minor errors are those that are classified as errors that can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The bridge details were incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

29. DOCUMENTATION OF WORK– Did the consultant submit the required documentation to meet INDOT requirements? Were the appropriate design specifications referenced?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – The required documentation was complete and exceeded expectations. The documentation required no revisions
- ☐ **Satisfactory** – The required documentation was complete and only had minor errors. The documentation required only minor revisions. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be corrected without added coordination.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The required documentation was incomplete and required major revisions. Major revisions are classified as errors that require revised documentation and additional coordination that hinders the project's progress. Few references to design specifications were provided.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

30. RESPONSIVENESS– How well did the designer cooperate with the reviewer?

- ☐ **Exceeds** – willingness to answer questions and make requested changes exceeded expectations.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The designer did revise the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and/or explained why revisions were not made. The designer showed a willingness to answer questions.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** – The designer did not revise most of the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and did not explain why most of the revisions were not made. The designer showed some cooperation in answering questions.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Geotechnical Engineering Performance Evaluation Criteria

31. OPERATIONS REVIEW DATE:

32. OPERATIONS REVIEWER:

33. OPERATIONS RESPONSIVENESS:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** Willingness to answer questions and make requested changes exceeded expectations and was proactive in addressing project issues.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** The consultant did revise the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and/or explained why revisions were not made and showed a willingness to answer questions.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** The Consultant did not revise some of the plans/documents in accordance with the comments and did not explain why some of the revisions were not made. Consultant showed some cooperation in answering questions but required several requests.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

34. OPERATIONS TARGET DATE:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** An acceptable final product was delivered more than 30 calendar days ahead of schedule.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** An acceptable final work product was delivered within the scheduled time.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** An acceptable final work product was delivered up to two months behind schedule.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** An acceptable final work product was delivered more than two months behind schedule.

35. OPERATIONS BUDGET:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** The consultant improved the operations budget more than 5%.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** The consultant maintained the operations budget within 5%.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** The consultant had budget slippage of 5% to 10%.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** The consultant exceeded the budget by more than 10%.

36. DRILLING PROCEDURES:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** All samples were collected in accordance with INDOT standards also additional samples were collected to accommodate any change in the scope of the project.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** All samples were collected in accordance with INDOT standards.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** Some samples were not collected in compliance with INDOT standards
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** Most samples were not in compliance with INDOT standards. As a result the consultant was instructed to remobilize and collect the required samples.

37. APPROPRIATE EQUIPMENT:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** Equipment mobilized was adequate and very good operating condition.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** Equipment was generally adequate but needed some adjustment during the filed operation.

- ☐ **Improvement Required-** Some equipment mobilized was not adequate and required an adjustment in the scope of work.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** Correct equipment was not mobilized causing delays, change in scope, and change in boring locations.

38. 24 HOUR WATER LEVELS:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** 24hr water level readings were recorded in all boreholes, some readings were taken after 72 hours or more.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** 24hr water level readings were recorded.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** 24hr water level readings were not recorded in all boreholes.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** No 24hr water level readings were recorded.
- ☐ **BACKFILLING BOREHOLES:**
- ☐ **Exceeds:** All boreholes were backfilled and re-backfilled after the settlement period.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** All boreholes were backfilled but not checked for settlement.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** Some boreholes backfilled correctly, consultant requested to go back and fill unfilled holes.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** None of the boreholes were backfilled. Consultant was required to go back and fill the holes.

39. TRAFFIC CONTROL:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** Met all requirements and exceeded expectations.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** Met all requirements with no minor adjustments.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** Was incomplete and required major revisions.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** Consultant did not have traffic control when it was required.

40. LABORATORY PROCEDURES:

- ☐ **Exceeds-** Laboratory tests performed in accordance with requirements and provided additional graphs and plots of test data.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** All tests were performed in accordance with standards and requirements.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** Some tests were not performed in accordance with standards and requirements.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** None of the tests were performed in accordance with the standards and requirements.

R/W Plan Performance Evaluation Criteria

R/W PLAN REPORTS -

1 Location Control Route Survey report.

All necessary USPL survey corners identified and located and all necessary property corners and subdivision corners located all old INDOT route surveys are tied to the new Location Control Route Survey.

- ☐ **Exceeds-** all USPL corners located, private survey monuments (property corners) located and boundaries or lot corners of subdivision monuments located, and no errors found and no additional survey information required..
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** all USPL corners located, private survey monuments (property corners) located and boundaries or lot corners of subdivision monuments located, and errors found but can be corrected by surveyor's affidavit and no additional survey information required..
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** all old route survey lines tied to new location control route survey, but USPL corner(s) missing or subdivision(s) not located, additional survey required but R/W Engineering can proceed .
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-** .several USPL corner(s) missing, extensive additional survey required, private survey property corners not located, Recorded Title 865 surveys not tied to location control route survey. R/W Eng can not proceed.

2. R/W Plan report.

All new R/W taking identified and labeled as temporary R/W and purpose of temporary R/W or R/W or perpetual easement. All PR-line(s) tied to survey line shown on the recorded location control route survey.

- ☐ **Exceeds-** all new R/W identified and all temporary R/W identified, all perpetual easements noted. No requests for revisions need from the designer.
- ☐ **Satisfactory-** all R/W identified and all temporary R/W identified along with perpetual easements, but construction limits found outside the existing or new R/W minor revision required, but R/W Engineering can proceed.
- ☐ **Improvement Required-** some new R/W not identified, purpose of temporary R/W missing. R/W Eng process will be delayed by design revisions.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory-..**New R/W break points station and offset mislabeled or station and offset missing. Needed temporary R/W missing. PR-line tie to control survey or does not mathematical close. R/W Eng can not proceed.

Existing R/W Report.

Identify how the State acquired title to existing R/W shown on the R/W plans for each new parcel and from other land owners within the project limits and statement of new parcels identified where the State does not hold title to the apparent existing R/W.

- ☐ **Exceeds**-all land owners and new parcels identified define how the state acquired existing R/W from the present or previous owners. Documentation reports, grant, warranty deed, county recording information include date of transfer and date of recording.
- ☐ **Satisfactory**-all new parcels identified define how the state acquired existing R/W from the present or previous owners, but documentation omits stating whether grant or warranty deed, but recording information including date of transfer and county recording date.
- ☐ **Improvement Required**- all new parcels identified define how the state acquired existing R/W from the present or previous owners, but documentation omits stating whether grant or warranty deed, but recording information including date of transfer and county recording date. But existing R/W acquired by old condemnation case, documentation concerning the condemnation case is incomplete or missing, or how existing R/W was acquired in the construction limits identified as incidental construction on the plans
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory**..no documentation concerning how the state acquired existing R/W is found or other old grants and or other transfer documents were used but have no county recording, signed or unsigned and origin of document is unknown.

4. Abstracting and title report.

Each title report includes a 20 year search of the public record and that all reference information is included to identify the caption real estate, and other interests or easements affecting the caption real estate were included in the report.

- **Exceeds** – title report includes 20 year search of caption real estate and all easements and special interests needs to be cleared, also contains all contiguous properties.
- **Satisfactory-** Title report includes 20 year search of caption real estate and all easements and special interests needs to be cleared, also contains all contiguous properties, but omits contiguous properties and some reference deeds missing, but parcel can be prepared for appraising.
- **Improvement Required**-title report includes 20 year search of part caption real estate, but includes copy of deed for contiguous real estate, but should have been noted as caption real estate parcel can be prepared, but will be delayed because of additional abstracting needed to verify ownership of property noted as contiguous, but is in fact part of the captioned real estate. All necessary easements and special interests are included.
- **Unsatisfactory-** Title report includes 20 year search of caption real estate, but title is by quit claim deed and warranty deed backup is missing, easements and special interests needs to be cleared are missing or omitted, also all or part of contiguous properties not included. Copy of subdivision plat missing and sell off to adjoining owner(s) missing.

R/W PARCEL (Packet) PREPARATION

1. All INDOT forms correctly filled out.
 2. All necessary legal descriptions for temporary R/W, fee R/W, Perpetual Easements and descriptions for clearance of special interests prepared per INDOT Manual.
 3. All necessary R/W Parcel Plats prepared per INDOT Manual and IAC Title 865.
 4. Supply closure check of each description prepared.
- **Exceeds** – R/W Parcel Plat, prepare per INDOT R/W Engineering Manual and Title 865, correct, legal description and area statement, all residue areas of owner calculated. L-10 filled out completely and correct. Legal description(s) mathematically close and, documentation of closure check included for each area calculated. Area computation sheet included and correct. All transfer documents are correct. All special interest stated in title report addressed either by documentation or documents prepared for clearing special interest.
 - **Satisfactory-** R/W Parcel Plat, prepared per INDOT R/W Engineering Manual and Title 865, correct, legal description and area statement, some residue areas of owner calculated other larger residues areas are left unknown. L-10 filled out completely and correct. Legal description(s) mathematically close and, documentation of closure check included for each area calculated. Area computation sheet included but error found in calculations, but can be correctly easily. All transfer documents are correct. All special interest stated in title report addressed either by documentation or documents prepared for clearing special interest..

- **Improvement Required-** R/W Parcel Plat, prepared per INDOT R/W Engineering Manual and Title 865, correct, legal description and area statement, some residue areas of owner calculated other larger residues areas are left unknown. L-10 filled out completely and correct, but areas stated in square feet and legal description area stated in acres. Legal description(s) mathematically close and, documentation of closure check included for each area calculated. Temporary R/W shown on plans but no legal description found in parcel packet. Transfer documents contain errors. Special interest stated in title report was not addressed either by documentation or documents prepared for clearing special interest.
- **Unsatisfactory--** R/W Parcel Plat, prepared per INDOT R/W Engineering Manual and Title 865, correct, but has several errors, (missing point numbers, owners name incorrect), legal description and area statement, no residue areas of owner were calculated residues areas are left unknown. L-10 filled out completely and correct, but areas stated in square feet and legal description area stated in acres. Legal description(s) do not mathematically close and, no documentation of closure check included for each area calculated. Temporary R/W shown on plans but no legal description found in parcel packet. Legal description prepared as fee taking, but in fact is a temporary taking; the incorrect transfer documents were prepared. Special interest stated in title report that needs to be cleared, but overlooked by R/W Engineer.

FINAL R/W PLANS

1. All property lines and road boundaries delineated per INDOT R/W Manual.
2. All easements and special interests found in the title report added to plans.
3. All current property owners identified by name and with Parcel number and letter suffix's as required by INDOT R/W Manual.
4. All special interests that need to be cleared identified by parcel number and letter suffix.
5. All subdivision and lot numbers added to plans.
6. All property line intersections and all road boundary intersections identified by station and offset.

Bridge Inspection Performance Evaluation Criteria

Inspection and Testing

41. INSPECTION:

- a) Was the Scope of Work completely followed?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - followed Scope completely
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - followed Scope to high degree
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not follow Scope on minor issues
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not follow Scope on major issues
- b) Were proper Traffic Control and Safety guidelines established and followed?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - above average guidelines met
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - 0 = followed proper guidelines
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not follow all proper guidelines
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not follow proper guidelines & caused traffic situations
- c) Did Inspectors inspect all required details to the level required?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - inspected everything and more at or above level required
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - inspected everything at the required level
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not inspect everything required or at the level required
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not inspect everything and/or inspected at a poor level
- d) Were INDOT's District and Central Office Staff notified of problems, findings, or deficiencies in a timely manner, and were Deficiency Reports written-up with enough detail?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - went out of their way to keep INDOT informed
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - followed proper guidelines on informing INDOT
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not follow all proper guidelines on informing INDOT
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - very poor in informing INDOT of their inspection work
- e) Were the inspections completed in a timely manner?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - completed prior to completion date
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - completed on time
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - completed just past the expected completion date
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - completed well past the expected completion date

42. TESTING:

- f) Did Inspectors work closely with the NDT Technicians to establish areas to test, determine the best NDT test and methods to use help, and interpret findings?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - worked very closely with NDT Techs in all matters
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - worked closely with NDT Techs

- ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not work very closely with NDT Techs
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not work at all well with NDT Techs
- g) Did DNT Technicians use standard test or test blocks to calibrate their equipment at appropriate times?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - used standard and special calibration techniques and checked continuously
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - used standard calibration techniques, and often enough
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not use standard calibration techniques or often enough
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not use standard calibration techniques at all
- h) Did the NDT Technicians explain their findings and output to Inspectors in enough detail?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - went out of their way to explain in detail what was or was not found to the Inspectors
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - followed proper guidelines on informing Inspectors
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not inform Inspectors of all findings in enough detail
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not inform Inspectors of findings
- i) Did the NDT Technicians re-paint all areas cleaned of paint for testing?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - re-painted all areas plus areas near by areas using all proper paints
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - repainted all areas cleaned as required, using proper paints
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not paint all areas in the proper manner, or did not use proper paints
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not paint areas cleaned for testing
- j) Are the Results of the NDT Technicians clear and concise, and presented in an easily understandable format?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - extra details and reported soon after the inspection
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - normal reports, sent in soon as possible
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - poor reports and/or sent in well after finding the problem
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - very poor report and/or sent in long after found in the field

Structural Analysis and Load Capacity Ratings

☐ **ANAYLSIS:**

- k) Were standard and accepted practices used for the analysis?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - used standard and special analysis techniques throughout
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - used standard practices on analysis
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not use standard analysis techniques throughout project
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not use standard analysis techniques at all

- l) Are results repeatable, clearly presented and fully explained?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - results are repeatable and were clearly explained with lots of extra detail
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - results are repeatable and were explained with proper detail
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - some results were not explained in enough detail and/or are not repeatable using standard programs
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - most results were not explained in enough detail and/or are not repeatable using standard programs
- m) Were assumptions and input data clearly noted and explained?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - assumptions and input data were clearly explained with lots of extra detail
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - assumptions and input data explained with proper detail
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - assumptions and input data not explained in enough detail
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - assumptions and input data not explained at all

43. LOAD CAPACITY RATINGS:

- n) Were the Load Raters knowledgeable about load rating processes and procedures of the specific Load Rating Program they used?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - very knowledgeable about many load rating processes and Rating Program
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - normal expected understanding of load rating processes and Rating Program
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not have full understanding of load rating work needed
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not have full understanding of load rating work needed and did not make full effort to get it
- o) Did the Load Raters clearly document all data input?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - did excellent job of documenting all input
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - documented all input
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - did not document all input
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not document input at all
- p) Were the Load Raters knowledgeable of INDOT's Bridge Plans, the various rating vehicles, rating methods, and rating programs?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - Very good understanding about all types of rating vehicles, rating methods, plans and data
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - normal expected understanding about all types of rating vehicles, rating methods, plans and data
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - poor understanding of about all types of rating vehicles and/or rating methods, plans and data
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - Did not have a full understanding of about all types of rating vehicles and/or rating methods, plans and data

- q) Were the Load Raters able to work at an acceptable pace to meet INDOT's needs?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - completed well in advance of completion date
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - completed on time
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - completed just past the expected completion date
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - completed well past the expected completion date

Report and Recommendations

44. REPORTS:

- r) Were Draft Reports submitted in a timely manner, and complete, accurate, well written, and used proper grammar?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - completed prior to completion date, required little review, and few errors
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - completed on time, required normal review time, no major errors
 - ☐ **Improvement Required**- completed just past the expected completion date, required lots of review time, a few major errors
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - completed well past the expected completion date, poorly written and/had many major errors
- s) Did the Draft Reports follow and adhere to all FHWA and INDOT Coding Guidelines?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - followed all required guidelines
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - generally followed all required guidelines
 - ☐ **Improvement Required**- did not all required guidelines on minor issues
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not all required guidelines on major issues
- t) Were all required Edit Checks done prior to submitting all Drafts and Final submittals of any data data?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - ran all required Edit Checks of data plus developed new checks
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - ran all required Edit Checks of data
 - ☐ **Improvement Required**- did not run all required Edit Checks of data on minor items
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not run all required Edit Checks of data on major items
- u) Did the Draft and Final electronic data submittals follow appropriate data rules such as using the correct programs, tables, queries, formats and reports, etc.?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - followed all required rules/guidelines
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - generally followed all required rules/guidelines
 - ☐ **Improvement Required**- did not all required rules/guidelines on minor issues
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not all required rule/guidelines on major issues

- v) Were all copies of Final Reports {paper form and electronic form} complete and had all corrections made prior to submittal, and was the submittal on time?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - completed prior to completion date, all correction made
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - completed on time, all correction made
 - ☐ **Improvement Required**- completed just past the expected completion date, did not make all corrections
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - completed well past the expected completion date, did not make all corrections

- w) Do all electronic Report contents open-up on INDOT computers, and work as they were intended?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - opened easily and ran as they should have
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - opened and ran as they should have with minor assistance
 - ☐ **Improvement Required**- did not open and/or run as they should have on some minor issues
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - did not open and/or run as they should have on some major issues

45. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- x) Are Recommendations clearly written, specific, and are the Recommendations reasonable based on INDOT's capabilities?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - well written, well organized, clear understanding, extra details, and recommendations are very reasonable with much support information
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - clear understanding of recommendations reported, recommendations are reasonable
 - ☐ **Improvement Required**- poorly written and/or unclear recommendations, that don't fully agree with rest of Report
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - badly written and/or no or unclear recommendations that do not agree with rest of Report

- y) Were re-inspection times, re-testing times, or re-rating times specified in a clear manner, and were they backed-up with good engineering reasoning?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - recommendations are very reasonable with much support information
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - recommendations are reasonable
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - recommendations are reasonable but do not fully agree with rest of Report
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - recommendations are unreasonable and/or do not agree with rest of Report

- z) Were Maintenance/Repair/Rehab Recommendations explained along with time frames for conducting this work?
 - ☐ **Exceeds** - recommendations are very reasonable with much support information
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - recommendations are reasonable
 - ☐ **Improvement Required** - recommendations are reasonable but don't fully agree with rest of Report

- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - recommendations are unreasonable and/or do not agree with rest of Report

aa) Were cost estimates provided for additional testing/inspection work, and needed corrective actions?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - estimates provided are reasonable with much support information
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - estimates provided are reasonable
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - estimates provided are reasonable but don't fully agree with rest of Report
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - estimates provided are unreasonable and/or do not agree with rest of Report

Environmental Agreement Performance Evaluation Criteria

Environmental Project

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

- a) Was text prepared according to guidelines?
- ☐ **Exceeds**- The text to the environmental document was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory**- The text to the environmental document was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Improvement required**- The text to the environmental document was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory**- The text to the environmental document was totally unsatisfactory.
- b) Were exhibits clear and appropriate?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - The exhibits to the environmental document were always clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - The exhibits to the environmental document were routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Improvement required** - The exhibits to the environmental document were not routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory**- The exhibits to the environmental document were totally unsatisfactory.
- c) Were analysis and response to outside comments appropriate?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - The environmental document always provided analysis and response to outside comments.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - The environmental document routinely provided analysis and response to outside comments.
 - ☐ **Improvement required** - The environmental document did not routinely provide analysis and response to outside comments.
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The environmental document's response to outside comments was totally unsatisfactory.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

- d) Were meeting/hearing materials clear and appropriate?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - The materials for the meeting/hearing were always clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - The materials for the meeting/hearing were routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Improvement required** - The materials for the meeting/hearing were not routinely clear and appropriate.

- ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The materials for the meeting/hearing were totally unsatisfactory.
- e) Was the consultant responsive to public comments and questions?
 - ❑ **Exceeds** - Public comments and questions were always responded to.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - Public comments and questions were routinely responded to.
 - ❑ **Improvement required** - Public comments and questions were not routinely responded to.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - Public comments and questions were not responded to.

SECTION 4(f) DOCUMENT

- f) Was text prepared according to guidelines?
 - ❑ **Exceeds** - The Section 4(f) document was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - The Section 4(f) document was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Improvement Required** - The Section 4(f) document was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The Section 4(f) document was totally unsatisfactory.
- g) Were exhibits clear and appropriate?
 - ❑ **Exceeds** - The exhibits to the Section 4(f) document were always clear and appropriate.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - The exhibits to the Section 4(f) document were routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ❑ **Improvement Required** - The exhibits to the Section 4(f) document were not routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The exhibits to the Section 4(f) document were totally unsatisfactory.
- h) Were analyses and responses to outside comments Appropriate?
 - ❑ **Exceeds** - The Section 4(f) document always provided analysis and response to outside comments.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - The Section 4(f) document routinely provided analysis and response to outside comments.
 - ❑ **Improvement required** - The Section 4(f) document did not routinely provide analysis and response to outside comments.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The Section 4(f) document's response to outside comments was totally unsatisfactory.

Ecological

ECOLOGICAL SURVEY REPORT

- a) Was data collection in accordance with guidelines?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - The data for the Ecological Survey Report was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - The data for the Ecological Survey Report was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Improvement required** - The data for the Ecological Survey Report was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The data for the Ecological Survey Report was totally unsatisfactory.
- b) Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - The text and analysis of the Ecological Survey Report was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Ecological Survey Report was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Improvement required** - The text and analysis of the Ecological Survey Report was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Ecological Survey Report was totally unsatisfactory.
- c) Were exhibits clear and appropriate?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - The exhibits to the Ecological Survey Report were always clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - The exhibits to the Ecological Survey Report were routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Improvement required** - The exhibits to the Ecological Survey Report were not routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The exhibits to the Ecological Survey Report were totally unsatisfactory.

WETLAND REPORTS/ DELINEATION

- d) Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?
- ☐ **Exceeds** - The data for the Wetlands Report/Delineation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Satisfactory** - The data for the Wetlands Report/Delineation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Improvement required** - The data for the Wetlands Report/Delineation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The data for the Wetlands Report/Delineation was totally unsatisfactory.

- e) Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?
- ❑ **Exceeds** - The text and analysis of the Wetlands Report/Delineation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Wetlands Report/Delineation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Improvement required** - The text and analysis of the Wetlands Report/Delineation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Wetlands Report/Delineation was totally unsatisfactory.
- f) Were exhibits clear and appropriate?
- ❑ **Exceeds** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Report/Delineation were always clear and appropriate.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Report/Delineation were routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ❑ **Improvement required** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Report/Delineation were not routinely clear and appropriate.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Report/Delineation were totally unsatisfactory.

WETLAND MITIGATION CONCEPTUAL PLAN

- g) Were permit requirements met?
- ❑ **Exceeds** - The Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan always met permit requirements.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - The Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan routinely met permit requirements.
 - ❑ **Improvement required** - The Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan did not routinely meet permit requirements.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan did not meet permit requirements.
- h) Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?
- ❑ **Exceeds** - The text and analysis of the Wetland Mitigation Conceptual Plan was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Satisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Wetland Mitigation Conceptual Plan was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Improvement required** - The text and analysis of the Wetland Mitigation Conceptual Plan was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
 - ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Wetland Mitigation Conceptual Plan was totally unsatisfactory.
- i) Were exhibits clear and appropriate?
- ❑ **Exceeds** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan were always clear and appropriate.

- ❑ **Satisfactory** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ❑ **Improvement required** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The exhibits to the Wetlands Mitigation Conceptual Plan were totally unsatisfactory.

Final Wetland Mitigation Plans

j) Were permit requirements met?

- ❑ **Exceeds**- The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan always met permit requirements.
- ❑ **Satisfactory**- The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan routinely met permit requirements.
- ❑ **Improvement required** - The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan did not routinely meet permit requirements.
- ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan did not meet permit requirements.

k) Were design requirements met?

- ❑ **Exceeds**- The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan always met design requirements.
- ❑ **Satisfactory**- The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan routinely met design requirements.
- ❑ **Improvement required** - The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan did not routinely meet design requirements.
- ❑ **Unsatisfactory**- The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan did not meet design requirements.

l) Were details complete and plan preparation met INDOT requirements?

- ❑ **Exceeds** - The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.
- ❑ **Satisfactory**- The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.
- ❑ **Improvement required** - The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.
- ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The Final Wetlands Mitigation Plan complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.

AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS

m) Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ❑ **Exceeds** - The text and analysis of the Air Quality Analysis was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ❑ **Satisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Air Quality Analysis was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ❑ **Improvement required** - The text and analysis of the Air Quality Analysis was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ❑ **Unsatisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Air Quality Analysis was totally unsatisfactory.

n) Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ **Exceeds**- The exhibits to the Air Quality Analysis were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The exhibits to the Air Quality Analysis were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ **Improvement Required**- The exhibits to the Air Quality Analysis were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory**- The exhibits to the Air Quality Analysis were totally unsatisfactory.

Noise Analysis and Abatement Design

NOISE ANALYSIS

a) Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ **Exceeds** -The text and analysis of the Noise Analysis was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** -The text and analysis of the Noise Analysis was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ **Improvement required** - The text and analysis of the Noise Analysis was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The text and analysis of the Noise Analysis was totally unsatisfactory.

b) Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - The exhibits to the Noise Analysis were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The exhibits to the Noise Analysis were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ **Improvement required** - The exhibits to the Noise Analysis were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory**- The exhibits to the Noise Analysis were totally unsatisfactory.

ABATEMENT DESIGN

Were design requirements met?

- ☐ Exceeds - The Noise Abatement design always met design requirements.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The Noise Abatement design routinely met design requirements.
- ☐ Improvement required - The Noise Abatement design did not routinely met design requirements.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The Noise Abatement design did not meet design requirements.

Were details complete and plan preparation met INDOT requirements?

- ☐ Exceeds - The Noise Abatement design complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The Noise Abatement design complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.

- ☐ Improvement required - The Noise Abatement design complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The Noise Abatement design complete details and plan preparation always met INDOT requirements.

Archaeological Investigations

Phase I

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase I Archaeological Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Phase I Archaeological Investigation were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase I Archaeological Investigation were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Phase I Archaeological Investigation were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase I Archaeological Investigation were totally unsatisfactory.

Phase II

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.

- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase II Archaeological Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Phase II Archaeological Investigation were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase II Archaeological Investigation were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Phase II Archaeological Investigation were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase II Archaeological Investigation were totally unsatisfactory.

Phase III

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Phase III Archaeological Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Phase I II Archaeological Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Phase III Archaeological Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Phase III Archaeological Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Phase III Archaeological Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase III Archaeological Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Phase III Archaeological Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.

- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase III Archaeological Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Phase III Archaeological Investigation were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase III Archaeological Investigation were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Phase III Archaeological Investigation were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase III Archaeological Investigation were totally unsatisfactory.

Documentation for Consultation/MOA

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Consultation/MOA was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Consultation/MOA was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Consultation/MOA was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Consultation/MOA Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were totally unsatisfactory.

Historic/Architectural Investigations

Phase I

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Phase I Historic/Architectural I Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Phase I Historic/Architectural I Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase I Historic/Architectural I Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase I Historic/Architectural Investigation were totally unsatisfactory.

Phase II

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Phase II Historic/Architectural I Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.

- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Phase II Historic/Architectural Investigation were totally unsatisfactory.

Documentation for Consultation/MOA

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Consultation/MOA was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Consultation/MOA was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Consultation/MOA was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Consultation/MOA Investigation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Consultation/MOA was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were routinely clear and appropriate.

- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Consultation/MOA were totally unsatisfactory.

HABS/HAER Documentation

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the HABS/HAER documentation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the HABS/HAER documentation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the HABS/HAER documentation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the HABS/HAER documentation was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the HABS/HAER documentation was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the HABS/HAER documentation was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the HABS/HAER documentation was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the HABS/HAER documentation was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the HABS/HAER documentation were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the HABS/HAER documentation were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the HABS/HAER documentation were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the HABS/HAER documentation were totally unsatisfactory.

Environmental Site Assessments (ESA)

ESA Phase I

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - Site inspection and interviews with property owners and neighbors in addition to readily available historical data sources including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records.

- ☐ Satisfactory - Site inspection conducted, but no interviews and readily available historical data sources including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records.
- ☐ Improvement required - Evidence that only a portion of the readily available historical data sources were used including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - No obvious evidence that the readily available historical data sources were used including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - Report is well organized, there is a physical site description, site inspection and interviews are presented, review of site history is presented, regulatory records review of findings are presented, and data evaluation is presented and reasonable.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Report is organized and understandable, there was a site inspection and those findings are in a physical site description, review of site history is presented, regulatory records review of findings are presented, and data evaluation is presented and reasonable.
- ☐ Improvement required - Report organization is not easily readable, there are minor errors or omissions, there is a physical site description (with or without a site inspection), review of site history is presented, regulatory records review of findings are presented, and data evaluation is presented.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Report organization is not easily readable, there are major or numerous errors or omissions, there is a physical site description (with or without a site inspection), review of site history is presented (maybe poorly), regulatory records review of findings are presented (maybe poorly), and data evaluation is presented but may not present reasonable conclusions.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - Report is well organized and the exhibits, figures, and tables are clear and readable and depicts both the physical site location map and the physical site layout drawing, color or other enhancements are utilized in the exhibits to make the report exceptional, and represent the data in a clear readable format, and regulatory records review of findings are presented in a clear readable format.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Report is organized and the exhibits, figures, and tables are clear and readable and depicts both the physical site location map and the physical site layout

drawing, represent the data in a clear readable format, and regulatory records review of findings are presented in a clear readable format.

- ☐ Improvement required - Report organization is not supported by sufficient exhibits, figures, and tables to clarify the physical site layout, regulatory records review of findings, and/or data evaluation, or there are minor errors or omissions. Maybe one or both the physical site location map and/or the physical site layout drawing are missing.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Report organization is not supported by any exhibits, figures, and tables to clarify the physical site layout, regulatory records review of findings, and/or data evaluation, or there are major or numerous errors or omissions. There is neither a physical site location map nor a physical site layout drawing in the report.

ESA Phase II

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - Site inspection and interviews with property owners and neighbors in addition to readily available historical data sources including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records. Sufficient borings and sampling have been performed to characterize the contamination; too many borings have not been performed.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Site inspection conducted, but no interviews and readily available historical data sources including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records. Sufficient borings and sampling have been performed to characterize the contamination; too many borings have not been performed.
- ☐ Improvement required - Evidence that only a portion of the readily available historical data sources were used including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records. Insufficient borings and sampling have been performed to characterize the contamination, or too many borings have been performed, and money has been wasted.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - No obvious evidence that the readily available historical data sources were used including, but not limited to, aerial photographs, fire insurance maps, land title records, USGS topography quadrant maps, local directories, zoning/land use records. Insufficient borings and sampling have been performed to characterize the contamination, or too many borings have been performed, and money has been wasted.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - Report is well organized, there is a physical site description, site inspection and interviews are presented, review of site history is presented, regulatory records review of findings are presented, and sampling data evaluation is presented and reasonable.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Report is organized and understandable, there was a site inspection and those findings are in a physical site description, review of site history is presented, regulatory records review of findings are presented, and sampling data evaluation is presented and reasonable.
- ☐ Improvement required - Report organization is not easily readable, there are minor errors or omissions, there is a physical site description (with or without a site inspection), review of site history is presented, regulatory records review of findings are presented, and sampling data is presented, but not evaluated or discussed.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Report organization is not easily readable, there are major or numerous errors or omissions, there is a physical site description (with or without a site inspection), review of site history is presented (maybe poorly), regulatory records review of findings are presented (maybe poorly), and sampling data is presented, but not evaluated, discussed, and/or reasonable conclusions presented.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - Report is well organized and the exhibits, figures, and tables are clear and readable and depicts both the physical site location map and the physical site layout drawing, color or other enhancements are utilized in the exhibits to make the report exceptional, and represent the data in a clear readable format, and regulatory records review of findings are presented in a clear readable format.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Report is organized and the exhibits, figures, and tables are clear and readable and depicts both the physical site location map and the physical site layout drawing, represent the data in a clear readable format, and regulatory records review of findings are presented in a clear readable format.
- ☐ Improvement required - Report organization is not supported by sufficient exhibits, figures, and tables to clarify the physical site layout, regulatory records review of findings, and/or data evaluation, or there are minor errors or omissions. Maybe one or both the physical site location map and/or the physical site layout drawing are missing.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Report organization is not supported by any exhibits, figures, and tables to clarify the physical site layout, regulatory records review of findings, and/or data evaluation, or there are major or numerous errors or omissions. There is neither a physical site location map nor a physical site layout drawing in the report.

ESA Remedial Design

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - Consultant has evaluated the entire site based on all the information provided by INDOT, and has performed further records search at IDEM, EPA or other sources for the site. Consultant has developed a reasonable Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on all available data. The consultant has demonstrated that the CAP will meet all the regulatory requirements, Federal, State, and Local. Consultant has utilized the Best Management Practices (BMP's) in the industry to develop the most cost effective, workable remedial design for the site. Consultant may have communicated with IDEM to gain a preliminary approval of the technologies they are presenting.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Consultant has evaluated the entire site based on all the information provided by INDOT. Consultant has developed a reasonable Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on all available data. The consultant has demonstrated that the CAP will meet all the regulatory requirements, Federal, State, and Local. Consultant has utilized the Best Management Practices (BMP's) in the industry to develop the most cost effective, workable remedial design for the site.
- ☐ Improvement required - Consultant has evaluated the site based on all the information provided only by INDOT. Consultant has developed an unreasonable Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on available data. Consultant has not utilized the Best Management Practices (BMP's) in the industry to develop the most cost effective, workable remedial design for this site.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Consultant has evaluated the site based on the information provided only by INDOT. Consultant has developed an unreasonable Corrective Action Plan (CAP) based on available data. Consultant has not utilized the Best Management Practices (BMP's) in the industry. Their recommendations and design will be costly and may not be a workable remedial design for this site.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - Report is well organized, there is a physical site description, review of site history is presented, all available site investigation data is presented, evaluated, and reasonable design recommendations are presented. The consultant has clearly presented all options, giving advantages and disadvantages, the costs to implement and monitor each remedial design are presented. Mention that IDEM has preliminarily approved the technology the consultant is presenting.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Report is organized and understandable, there is a physical site description, review of site history is presented, all available site investigation data is presented, evaluated, and reasonable design recommendations are presented. The consultant has presented at least two (2) options, giving advantages and disadvantages, cost to implement and monitor each remedial design presented.
- ☐ Improvement required - Report organization is not easily readable, there are minor errors or omissions, there is a physical site description, review of site history is presented,

available site investigation data is presented, evaluated, and only one design option is recommended. The consultant has not covered all the advantages and disadvantages or the cost to implement and monitor this single remedial design.

- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Report organization is not easily readable, there are major or numerous errors or omissions, there is a poorly written physical site description, review of site history is presented (maybe poorly written and/or understandable), available site investigation data is not presented, evaluated, and/or only one design option is recommended. The consultant has not covered all the advantages and disadvantages or the cost to implement and monitor the remedial design option.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - Report is well organized and the exhibits, figures, and tables are clear and readable and depicts both the physical site location map and the physical site layout drawing, color or other enhancements are utilized in the exhibits to make the report exceptional, and represent the data in a clear readable format. Exhibits assist in explaining and justifying the remedial design evaluation and selection criteria. Exhibits assist in analyzing the cost effectiveness of the chosen remedial design.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Report is organized and the exhibits, figures, and tables are clear and readable and depicts both the physical site location map and the physical site layout drawing, and represent the data in a clear readable format. Exhibits assist in explaining and justifying the remedial design evaluation and selection criteria. Exhibits assist in analyzing the cost effectiveness of the chosen remedial design.
- ☐ Improvement required - Report organization is not supported by sufficient exhibits, figures, and tables to clarify the physical site layout, or assist in explaining and justifying the remedial design evaluation and selection criteria, or there are minor errors or omissions. Exhibits are not used to assist in analyzing the cost effectiveness of the chosen remedial design. Maybe one or both the physical site location map and/or the physical site layout drawing are missing.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Report organization is not supported by any exhibits, figures, and tables to clarify the physical site layout, or assist in explaining and justifying the remedial design, or there are major and/or numerous errors or omissions. There is neither a physical site location map nor a physical site layout drawing in the report.

Karst Studies

Was data collected in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The data for the Karst Studies was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws/Karst MOA.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The data for the Karst Studies was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws/Karst MOA.

- ☐ Improvement required - The data for the Karst Studies was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws/Karst MOA.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The data for the Karst Studies was totally unsatisfactory.

Was text/analysis prepared in accordance with guidelines?

- ☐ Exceeds - The text and analysis of the Karst Studies was always prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws/Karst MOA.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The text and analysis of the Karst Studies was routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws/Karst MOA.
- ☐ Improvement required - The text and analysis of the Karst Studies was not routinely prepared according to guidelines/regulations/laws/Karst MOA.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The text and analysis of the Karst Studies was totally unsatisfactory.

Were exhibits clear and appropriate?

- ☐ Exceeds - The exhibits to the Karst Studies were always clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The exhibits to the Karst Studies were routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Improvement required - The exhibits to the Karst Studies were not routinely clear and appropriate.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The exhibits to the Karst Studies were totally unsatisfactory.

Right of Way Acquisition Services Performance Evaluation Criteria

Right of Way Acquisition Services

Evaluators- Real Estate Manager, Acquisition Administrator, Regional Real Estate Administrator

1. Were the right of way functions completed within the approved milestone dates?

- Exceeds- All milestone dates were met and the right of way was cleared before INDOT's Ready For Contracts scheduled date.
- Satisfactory- Most milestone dates were met and the right of way was cleared before INDOT's Ready For Contracts scheduled date.
- Improvement Required- Some milestone dates were met and right of way was cleared after INDOT's Ready for Contracts scheduled date.
- Unsatisfactory- Most milestone dates were missed and right of way was cleared after INDOT's Ready for Contracts scheduled date.

2. Was the right of way legally acquired?

Exceeds- All appraisals and acquisitions meet applicable regulations, laws & standards.

Satisfactory- All appraisals and acquisitions meet applicable regulations, laws & standards after minor corrections.

Improvement Required- Some appraisals and acquisitions contain significant errors requiring additional work or owner contact in order to meet applicable regulations, laws and standards.

Unsatisfactory- Some appraisals and acquisitions contain violations of applicable regulations, laws or standards.

3. Did the consultant communicate adequately with INDOT staff?

Exceeds- Consultant provides monthly updates of project status. Notifies INDOT of problems in a timely manner and advises INDOT of solutions. Responds promptly to INDOT questions or requests.

Satisfactory- Consultant notifies INDOT of problems and advises of solutions. Responds promptly to INDOT questions or requests.

Improvement Required- Fails to provide INDOT project status. Does not notify INDOT of problems in a timely manner or offer solutions. Does not promptly respond to INDOT questions or requests.

Unsatisfactory- Fails to provide INDOT project status. Does not notify INDOT of problems. Fails to respond to INDOT questions or requests.

Title Research

☐ Acceptable – all the items, 1 to 7 listed below included in Title and Encumbrance Report.

1. Does Title and Encumbrance Report include a 20 year search of the county records, or to a warranty deed transfer at least 20 years old? Is the chain of title complete? If evidence of court action was revealed in deeds found in chain of title, is (was) it necessary to research county court clerks office?
2. Does the Title and Encumbrance Report include copies of all reference deeds, mentioned in other deeds in the title report?
3. If description calls for lot in subdivision(s), was copy of subdivision plat attached to report?
4. Does the Title and Encumbrance Report include all tax ID numbers and tax statement information?
5. Does the Title and Encumbrance Report include copies of mortgages or statement, no mortgage record found?
6. Does Title and Encumbrance Report include statement of Judgment Search and if found copies of judgment(s)?

7. If private surveys are called for in deeds found in the chain of title, were copies of the private surveys included with the title report or statement surveys could no be found?

☐ Un-acceptable –one or more of the above items missing.

Value Analysis

Evaluators will be the Acquisition Administrator, Regional Real Estate Administrator & Regional Appraisal Program Director

1. Did the value analysis meet all INDOT requirements?

☐ Exceeds – The value analysis meets all requirements of the INDOT’s Appraisal Section; Defines Highest and Best of the parcel; defines the Scope of Work; defines damages to the residue; defines land improvements to be acquired; defines cost-to-cure issues; properly documents comparables; documentation of comparables; produces report by contracted time.

Satisfactory - The value analysis meets INDOT’s requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which are easily adjusted for without additional coordination and analysis.

☐ Improvement Required - The value analysis did not meet all INDOT’s Appraisal Sections requirements, there were areas of major re-analysis and coordination. Major area areas of reanalysis and coordination are classified as errors that require redefining of Highest and Best Use; Scope of Work; damages to residue; cost-to-cure issues; documentation of comparables or delivery of report that hinders the project’s progress (contracted time frame).

☐ Unsatisfactory - The Consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Appraisal

Evaluators will be the Acquisition Administrator, Regional Real Estate Administrator, Regional Real Estate Appraisal Program Director

Appraisal Problem Analysis:

1. Did the appraisal problem analysis meet all INDOT requirements?

- ☐ Exceeds – The appraisal problem analysis meet all requirements of the INDOT’s Appraisal Section; Defines Highest and Best of the parcel; defines the Scope of Work; defines damages to the residue; defines land improvements to be acquired; defines cost-to-cure issues; produces report by contracted time.
- ☐ Satisfactory – The appraisal problem analysis meet INDOT’s requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which are easily adjusted for without additional coordination and analysis.
- ☐ Improvement Required – The Appraisal Problem Analysis did not meet all INDOT’s Appraisal Sections requirements, there were areas of major re-analysis and coordination. Major area areas of reanalysis and coordination are classified as errors that require redefining of Highest and Best use; Scope of Work; damages to residue; cost-to-cure issues or delivery of report that hinders the project’s progress (contracted time frame).
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The Consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Appraisal Report

2. Did the appraisal report meet all INDOT requirements?

- ☐ Exceeds – The appraisal report meets all requirements of the INDOT’s Appraisal Section; Defines Highest and Best of the parcel; defines the Scope of Work; defines damages to the residue; defines land improvements to be acquired; defines cost-to-cure issues; properly documents comparables; documentation of comparables; produces report by contracted time.
- ☐ Satisfactory - The appraisal report meets INDOT’s requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which are easily adjusted for without additional coordination and analysis.
- ☐ Improvement Required - The Appraisal Report did not meet all INDOT’s Appraisal Sections requirements, there were areas of major re-analysis and coordination. Major area areas of reanalysis and coordination are classified as errors that require redefining of Highest and Best Use; Scope of Work; damages to residue; cost-to-cure issues; documentation of comparables or delivery of report that hinders the project’s progress (contracted time frame).
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The Consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Appraisal Review

Evaluators will be the Acquisition Administrator, Regional Real Estate Administrator & Regional Appraisal Program Director

Review of Appraisal Report

3. Did the Review Appraisal report meet all of INDOT requirements?
- ☐ Exceeds – The review appraisal report meets all requirements of the INDOT’s Appraisal Section; Defines Highest and Best of the parcel; defines the Scope of Work; defines damages to the residue; defines land improvements to be acquired; defines cost-to-cure issues; recommends estimated value believed to be just compensation; produces report by contracted time.
 - ☐ Satisfactory - The appraisal review report meets INDOT’s requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which are easily adjusted for without additional coordination and analysis.
 - ☐ Improvement Required - The Appraisal Review Report did not meet all INDOT’s Appraisal Sections requirements, there were areas of major re-analysis and coordination. Major area areas of reanalysis and coordination are classified as errors that require redefining of Highest and Best Use; Scope of Work; damages to residue; cost-to-cure issues or delivery of report that hinders the project’s progress (contracted time frame).
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory - The Consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Negotiation

Evaluators will be the Acquisition Administrator, Regional Real Estate Administrator, Regional Real Estate Project Management Program Director

1. Did the consultant secure or condemn the parcel within the scheduled target date?
- ☐ Exceeds – The parcel was secured or condemned within one month of assignment.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – The parcel was secured or condemned within 3 months of assignment.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – The parcel was secured or condemned between 3 and 6 months from assignment.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – The parcel was secured or condemned later than 6 months from assignment.

2. Were regulations met?

- ☐ Exceeds – The parcel meets all requirements of INDOT Policies, Indiana Code 32-24-1, and the Uniform Act 49 CFR Part 24.
- ☐ Satisfactory – The parcel meets all requirements of INDOT Policies, Indiana Code 32-24-1, and the Uniform Act 49 CFR Part 24 with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ Improvement Required – The parcel did not meet all INDOT Policies, Indiana Code 32-24-1, and the Uniform Act 49 CFR Part 24. Major revisions were required to comply with regulations. Major revisions are classified as errors that require additional coordination that hinders the parcel's progress.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The parcel did not meet any of the requirements of INDOT Policies, Indiana Code 32-24-1, and the Uniform Act 49 CFR Part 24.

3. Do conveyance instruments meet the legal requirements to convey title? If condemned, is condemnation report complete?

- ☐ Exceeds – The conveyance documents meet all legal requirements to convey title. If condemned the condemnation is complete with detail and accuracy.
- ☐ Satisfactory – The conveyance documents or condemnation report meet legal requirements with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as errors which can easily be incorporated without added coordination.
- ☐ Improvement Required – The conveyance instruments or condemnation report do not meet all requirements and required major corrections. Major corrections are those which require revised details and additional coordination that hinders the parcels progress.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The conveyance instruments or condemnation report do not comply with any of the above.

4. Were all interests identified and was clear title obtained?

- ☐ Exceeds – Clear title was obtained from all parties of interest and lien holders on a secured parcel. With a condemned parcel, all parties of interest and lien holders were identified and noted in condemnation report.
- ☐ Satisfactory – Clear title was obtained from all parties of interest and lien holders with the exception of those that were cleared by affidavit or waiver.
- ☐ Improvement Required – Clear title was not obtained from all parties of interest and lien holders, nor were affidavits obtained to clear them. With a condemned parcel, some parties of interest and lien holders were not identified. These errors required contact with the interest holders for obtaining clearance, and hinders the parcel's process.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not comply with any of the above

5. Were all forms correct/complete/can payment be made?

- ☐ Exceeds – All forms were complete and correct. Voucher(s) agree with appraisal or administrative settlement. All parties of interest have signed voucher as claimant or lien holder. Check delivery instructions are correct/included when required. W-9(s) agree with Voucher. Status report is accurate, reporting all required information.
- ☐ Satisfactory – All forms were complete and correct with only minor errors. Minor errors are classified as those which can easily be corrected without added coordination.
- ☐ Improvement Required – Forms did not meet all INDOT requirements and required major revisions/corrections. Major corrections are classified as those that require additional coordination that hinders the parcel's progress.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not comply with any of the above.

Relocation

Evaluators will be Acquisition Administrator, Acquisition Relocation Program Directors 1 & 2

Conduct Initial Relocation Meeting

- 1) Did the consultant have the in-person meeting to explain the relocation program within 10 working days of assignment?
 - ☐ Exceeds – Met this requirement 100% of the time.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – Met this requirement 90% of the time.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – Met this requirement 80% of the time.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – Met this requirement less than 80% of the time.

Complete Comparable Search and Issuance of the 90-Day Entitlement Letter

- 2) Did the consultant locate a decent, safe and sanitary comparable dwelling and issue the 90-day entitlement letter within 60 days of the initial relocation meeting?
 - ☐ Exceeds – Met this requirement 100% of the time.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – Met this requirement 90% of the time.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – Met this requirement 80% of the time.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – Met this requirement less than 80% of the time.

Claim Vouchers and Supporting Documentation

- 3) Did the consultant's relocation claim vouchers and supporting documentation meet INDOT and federal requirements?
 - ☐ Exceeds – Met this requirement 100% of the time.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – Met this requirement 95% of the time.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – Met this requirement 85% of the time.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – Met this requirement less than 85% of the time.

Responding to Phone Calls and Written Correspondents

- 4) Did the consultant's respond to all phone calls and written correspondents within a 48 hour period?
- ☐ Exceeds – Met this requirement 100% of the time.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – Met this requirement 95% of the time.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – Met this requirement 85% of the time.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – Met this requirement less than 85% of the time.

Final Submittal of the Relocation Parcel File

- 5) Did the consultant's complete and submit the final relocation packet 30 days from the date of the final relocation claim filed by the displacee?
- ☐ Exceeds – Met this requirement 100% of the time.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – Met this requirement 95% of the time.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – Met this requirement 85% of the time.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – Met this requirement less than 85% of the time.

SYSTEMS PLANNING

1. Did the consultant adequately define and prepare the purpose and need statements?
- ☐ Exceeds - The purpose and need documents are prepared in accordance with Environmental streamlining guidelines and are clear and well documented The consultant was responsive to comments. The documents were prepared ahead of schedule.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – The purpose and need documents are prepared in accordance with environmental streamlining guidelines and are clear and well documented with only minor revisions needed. Minor revisions are described as those that do not require additional coordination. Consultant was responsive to comments and prepared the purpose and need in a timely manner.
 - ☐ Improvement Required – The purpose and need documents are clear and well documented but fail to meet environmental streamlining guidelines or major revisions were required. The consultant was responsive to comments.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory – The purpose and need documents do not meet any of the above criteria.
2. Were the traffic forecasting and analysis based on accepted practices and good models?
- ☐ Exceeds- The traffic forecasting and analysis considered more than one model and approach and is clearly documented. The analysis included local, MPO, or regional models and highway statistics as well as a review of state-of the art practices. The overall analysis exceeded INDOT expectations by considering the effects of ramp-metering, tolling, and other low cost strategies on traffic volumes.
 - ☐ Satisfactory – The forecasting and analysis is well documented and in general consider local factors as well as state of the art practices.

- ☐ Improvement Required - The forecasting and analysis is not clearly documented and not verified by secondary sources. The overall analysis requires refinement.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The forecasting and analysis do not meet any of the above criteria

3. Did the Consultant identify a reasonable set of preliminary alternatives and adequately screen alternatives?

- ☐ Exceeds – The consultant reviewed multiple preliminary alternatives and gathered external input during the process. Alternatives were screened to meet the purpose and needs criteria. All alternatives reviewed are clearly documented. The consultant clearly demonstrated responsiveness to comments. Alternatives were reviewed in a timely manner and exceeded INDOT expectations.
- ☐ Satisfactory – The consultant reviewed multiple alternatives but failed to include comments or adequately document each alternative. Screening of alternatives was satisfactory and left a reasonable number of feasible projects for further evaluation or a single recommendation.
- ☐ Improvement Required – The consultant did not clearly document alternatives reviewed or failed to include one or more alternatives such as the “no-build” alternative. The consultant was not responsive to comments or failed to screen alternatives that did not meet the purpose and needs criteria.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - The forecasting and analysis do not meet any of the above criteria

4. Was a Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) established and managed to improve the planning study final product?

- ☐ Exceeds – The consultant established a representative committee that was able to provide concise input into the planning study. The consultant established regular meetings and managed the process to incorporate input throughout the planning study process. The meetings are well organized and focused. The CAC’s role and responsibility for a beneficial output exceeded Department expectations.
- ☐ Satisfactory – The consultant established a representative committee that benefited the planning study process. Periodic meetings were held and documented throughout the planning process but were not well organized. This rating also includes studies for which non CAC is required.
- ☐ Improvement Required – The consultant failed to form a representative committee or allowed the committee to be dominated by a single interest instead of considering the interest of the entire study area. Alternatively, the consultant formed a functioning committee but failed to schedule regular meetings throughout the process to incorporate their input. Meetings were not well organized.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not meet any of the above criteria

5. Were Public Information Meetings held according to federal and state requirements and INDOT standard practices?

- ☐ Exceeds – The consultant established and managed meetings that gathered public input in a timely fashion as required by federal and state law and which exceeded INDOT expectations. The meetings were well organized, focused, and well documented. The

consultant used innovative approaches to increase attendance at meetings and consistently summarized and documented the meetings events.

- ☐ Satisfactory – The consultant established meetings as required by law and INDOT standard practices. Meetings were well organized and focused but did not exceed expectations.
- ☐ Improvement Required – The consultant did not meet all INDOT requirements for public meetings or the meetings were not well-organized and focused. Public meetings
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not meet any of the above criteria

6. Were the services and overall project management by the consultant cost-effective?

- ☐ Exceeds – The consultant study presented a concise statement of purpose and need and based the narrowing of selections on project feasibility, well-documented models, and highway statistics. The study followed environmental streamlining guidelines and considered all aspects of planning. The consultant exceeded expectations by researching and applying state of the art practices and or innovative solutions that decreased project cost projections. The study clearly facilitated the decision making process for INDOT. The study may have been produced under the original budget guidelines
- ☐ Satisfactory –The consultant performed an in-depth study and analysis of needs, purpose, and alternatives that was well documented. No-cost-time-extensions were not granted for the study and the study clearly facilitated the decision making process at INDOT. The study included a concise executive summary.
- ☐ Improvement Required – The consultant study required a no-cost-time-extension and excessive oversight by INDOT staff. The study documents were not well organized or failed to address all aspects of planning. Alternatively, the consultant was not responsive to INDOT and failed to adequately communicate to the multiple stakeholders.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory – The consultant did not meet any of the above criteria. The study did not facilitate INDOT decision making processes.

TRAFFIC DATA

TRAFFIC DATA COLLECTION

Traffic Data Collection Performance Evaluation Criteria

Were the Count reports delivered in a timely manner?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - Counts turned in same week counts taken.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - Counts turned in by the next Tuesday after counts taken.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - Counts turned in greater than 1 week after counts taken.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - Counts turned in greater than 2 weeks after counts taken.

Was the Quality of sufficiently high quality such that errors were minimized?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - No errors found per 20 reports.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - One error found per 20 reports.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - Greater than 1 error found per 20 reports.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - Greater than 3 errors found per 20 reports.

How responsive was the Project Manager to requests from the Agency?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - The Consultant was always responsive and promptly replied with all requests.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The Consultant was routinely responsive and promptly replied with nearly all requests.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - The Consultant was not routinely responsive or was resistant to requests for information or minor changes. Repeated involvement of Department personnel was required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The Consultant was difficult and harmed project completion.

How accurate was the estimate submitted for the project?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - Estimate was within 5% of actual cost.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - Estimate was within 10% of actual cost.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - Estimate was within 30% of actual cost.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - Estimate was greater than 30% of actual cost.

TRAFFIC DATA FORECASTING

Traffic Forecasting Performance Evaluation Criteria

Were the Forecast reports delivered in a timely manner?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - Reports were turned in ahead of promised submittal date.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - Reports were turned in on promised submittal date.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - Reports were turned in less than 2 weeks after promised submittal date.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - Reports were turned in greater than 2 weeks after promised submittal date.

How responsive was the Project Manager to requests from the Agency?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - The Consultant was always responsive and promptly replied with all requests.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - The Consultant was routinely responsive and promptly replied with nearly all requests.
- ☐ **Improvement Required** - The Consultant was not routinely responsive or was resistant to requests for information or minor changes. Repeated involvement of Department personnel was required.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - The Consultant was difficult and harmed project completion.

How accurate was the estimate submitted for the project?

- ☐ **Exceeds** - Estimate was within 5% of actual cost.
- ☐ **Satisfactory** - Estimate was within 10% of actual cost.

- ☐ **Improvement Required** - Estimate was within 30% of actual cost.
- ☐ **Unsatisfactory** - Estimate was greater than 30% of actual cost.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC CAPACITY AND OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

1. Did the consultant provide quality services?
 - ☐ Exceeds - Surpassed expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented in a clear, concise manner.
 - ☐ Satisfactory - Met but did not exceed expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented in a clear, concise manner.
 - ☐ Improvement Required - Generally met expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented in a clear, concise manner; though in part the services were somewhat less than satisfactory.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory - Did not meet expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented in a clear, concise manner; that is, services were mostly inadequate.
2. Did the consultant provide services in a timely manner?
 - ☐ Exceeds - Delivered work considerably ahead of prescribed schedules/timelines.
 - ☐ Satisfactory - Met prescribed schedules/timelines, but did not deliver work considerably early.
 - ☐ Improvement Required - Fell somewhat behind prescribed schedules/timelines, though not considerably so.
 - ☐ Unsatisfactory - Delivered work considerably behind prescribed schedules/timelines.
3. Was the consultant responsive to the Department?
 - ☐ Exceeds - Went beyond expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services, from contract negotiation and preparation to

invoices and billing to requests for status reports and information to corrections based on agency review of deliverables, etc.

- ☐ Satisfactory - Met but did not exceed expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services.
- ☐ Improvement Required - Generally met expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services, though in some aspects responsiveness was less than expected.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Did not in for the most part meet expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services.

4. Were the services and overall project management by the consultant cost-effective?

- ☐ Exceeds - Overall contract services were exceptionally cost-effective, in terms of the value of work deliverables in comparison to the hours/fees charged.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Overall contract services were of fair value to the agency, but not exceptionally so.
- ☐ Improvement Required - Generally fell somewhat below expectations with respect to value for overall services, though not significantly below.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Overall contract services were of demonstrably unsatisfactory value to the agency; meaning, the hours/fees charged far exceeded the worth of services and products provided.

HIGHWAY SAFETY ANALYSIS

1. Did the consultant provide quality services?

- ☐ Exceeds - Surpassed expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented in a clear, concise manner.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Met but did not exceed expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented in a clear, concise manner.
- ☐ Improvement Required - Generally met expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented

in a clear, concise manner; though in part the services were somewhat less than satisfactory.

- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Did not meet expectations and standards for appropriate, sound, and reliable work, with findings presented in a clear, concise manner; that is, services were mostly inadequate.

2. Did the consultant provide services in a timely manner?

- ☐ Exceeds - Delivered work considerably ahead of prescribed schedules/timelines.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Met prescribed schedules/timelines, but did not deliver work considerably early.
- ☐ Improvement Required - Fell somewhat behind prescribed schedules/timelines, though not considerably so.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Delivered work considerably behind prescribed schedules/timelines.

3. Was the consultant responsive to the Department?

- ☐ Exceeds - Went beyond expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services, from contract negotiation and preparation to invoices and billing to requests for status reports and information to corrections based on agency review of deliverables, etc.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Met but did not exceed expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services.
- ☐ Improvement Required - Generally met expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services, though in some aspects responsiveness was less than expected.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Did not in for the most part meet expectations and usual practice for responsiveness to the Department for the various elements of contract services.

4. Were the services and overall project management by the consultant cost-effective?

- ☐ Exceeds - Overall contract services were exceptionally cost-effective, in terms of the value of work deliverables in comparison to the hours/fees charged.
- ☐ Satisfactory - Overall contract services were of fair value to the agency, but not exceptionally so.

- ☐ Improvement Required - Generally fell somewhat below expectations with respect to value for overall services, though not significantly below.
- ☐ Unsatisfactory - Overall contract services were of demonstrably unsatisfactory value to the agency; meaning, the hours/fees charged far exceeded the worth of services and products provided.